



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

faculty of self-assertion, the inherent will-power, to do what they know to be their duty in this regard.

There are those, and the number is legion, who regard the ministerial office merely as a profession, or perhaps a kind of business. The problem with which they continually wrestle is, how they may get most out of it. The aim of all their work is, not what they can do for the people whom they have been called to serve (in these cases, the call can scarcely be regarded a divine one), but what they can do for themselves, in connection with their people. To be sure, some of this class fancy that, by becoming scholars, their influence will be increased, and consequently, that their acquisitions will be greater; but the work accomplished with such a motive will seldom stand the test; and further, the number who study from such a motive is so small as scarcely to deserve notice. Men of this character, it must be confessed, can never hope to be scholars, or scholarly.

There are other men, constituting as large a class as the former, who mean well, but do badly. They feel, in their inmost soul, the necessity of continuous, never-ceasing intellectual work. They realize that they are gradually but surely losing ground. They know that, long before their physical powers are exhausted by old age, their mental powers will be, practically, dead. They know, too, that they are expected to be scholarly, to be authorities at least on matters that pertain to the Divine Word. They have all these and many other incentives to exertion; but they are not sufficiently strong to follow out their own convictions. These men spend precious hours in day-dreaming and in idle conversation. They find time for the perusal of all the details narrated in the daily newspapers; they visit unceasingly, under the delusion that they are doing pastoral work. They have given up all their student-habits—if, indeed, they ever possessed any; they have no regular plan of study; their life is from one day to the next, from one week to the next. Can studious work, can scholarship, be expected of these?

Now, it is men of these classes who so emphatically and so unremittingly assert that scholarship cannot be expected of the ministry. Set it down as a fact, that the man who proclaims this doctrine is a man who either has no desire for scholarship, or, having the desire, has not the application which will make it possible for him to gain it. It is, therefore, not the nature of the work required in the ministry, but the character of the men engaged in the ministry, that is responsible for the alleged lack of scholarship.

But while the classes referred to above are large,—too large, in truth, for the welfare of the churches,—there is a third class from whom one never hears the claim that ministers cannot be scholars. This class is made up of men who, realizing the awful responsibility that rests upon them as preachers of the Word, believing that it devolves upon them so to act as to make their lives, even in advanced old age, of service to the cause, and knowing that only by the hardest and most unrelaxing mental effort they may hope to do what has been given them to do, are scholarly, and, in many cases, are scholars. The fact in the case is that by no other class of men is scholarship so easy of attainment as by the minister, nor is there any other calling in which it is so necessary for the highest and truest success.

---

**The Old Testament Revision.**—The present is a trying time for those who profess to be, in any sense, Old Testament scholars. In a lecture delivered during the past summer, a leading editor made the statement that, of all men connected

with religious and theological work, the professor of the Old Testament department in our theological seminaries occupied the most responsible position. Not least important among the questions which present themselves to him, and which he is expected to answer, are those which relate to the lately published Revision of the Old Testament. Some of these he need have no hesitation in answering promptly and emphatically. There are others the gravity of which only those who have studied most deeply can appreciate; and which only those who have studied superficially are willing to answer at their first presentation. There are few men, even among Old Testament professors, who are in a position to speak dogmatically.

Among the questions which may be answered unhesitatingly in the affirmative are these:

- (1) Was a revision of the Old Testament needed?
- (2) Was the plan adopted for making this Revision, upon the whole, the best possible?
- (3) Were the men who were chosen to serve on the committees, competent scholars?
- (4) Is the Revision which they have given us an improvement upon the old version?
- (5) Is the Revision, for practical purposes, a true presentation of the original?
- (6) Would the interest of Bible study be subserved by its general adoption as an authorized version?

(7) Should every Bible student use his influence in favor of its adoption?

Among the questions which may as unhesitatingly be answered in the negative, are the following:

- (1) Is the Revision what students and scholars, not engaged in the work of revision, supposed it would be?
- (2) Is the Revision what students and scholars might reasonably have expected it to be?
- (3) Has it been regarded by scholars as a satisfactory piece of work?
- (4) Should these committees have attempted a revision rather than a new translation?
- (5) Was the rule a satisfactory one which required a two-thirds vote for the adoption of any change, and by which many important changes were prevented, which would have been made had a majority of the votes been sufficient for adoption?
- (6) Is the Revision of the Old Testament as satisfactory as that of the New?
- (7) Will this Revision, however satisfactory, render unnecessary the study of the original languages by ministers and those who are expected to teach the Word?

Among the questions which can be answered only after careful study, and in reference to which there is certainly room for difference of opinion, are the following:

- (1) Did the Revisers pay that attention to the question of the text which its importance demanded?
- (2) Did they even avail themselves of the material for improving the text which was within their reach?
- (3) Would it have been wise for them to have made an effort to establish a new text?

(4) Had the time come for Old Testament scholars to take up for criticism and emendation the text of the Old Testament?

(5) Did the Revisers, as a body, whatever may be said of them as individuals, make such changes as were demanded by the laws of Hebrew syntax as accepted and taught by the present generation of scholars?

(6) Did the Revisers do wisely in not printing the prophetic portions in the form of poetry?

(7) In the arrangement of the poetical portions, is the division of members, as given by them, according to the best treatment of the principles of Hebrew poetry?

(8) In the translation of words of rare occurrence, has sufficient care been taken to make use of the assistance which is to be derived from the cognate languages, especially the Assyrian and Arabic?

(9) Has sufficient attention been paid to the results of Old Testament theology, that department which, it is true, is in its infancy, but which is certainly to have great influence, not only upon our general ideas of Bible truth, but upon the force and signification of individual words?

(10) Have the Revisers been too conservative in retaining old and obsolete expressions?

These last are questions which deserve consideration. If errors have been made, if a wrong policy has been pursued, if the best possible work has not been done, it is right that there should be discussion. Two points, however, should be held in mind: (1) What is wanted in this discussion is proof, not assertion; (2) the Revisers as a body are responsible for the Revision, and we are not to suppose that individual members either endorsed all the changes that were made, or desired no others to be made; in other words, the Revision which has been given us is largely a compromise.